

FREE CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

Volume I.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY AUGUST 9, 1866.

Number 45

The "Dead Letter" Men Condemned.

In a former issue, we published copious extracts from the "Presbyterian" of July 18, going to show that, according to the opinion of Dr. Monfort, Drs. Humphrey and Smith were misrepresenting the action of the Assembly, in stating that the unconstitutional orders of the Assembly of 1865, were a "dead letter," and were so regarded generally; and that even the Assembly of 1866, so construed them. Whether Drs. Humphrey and Smith so believe, in view of the documentary evidence to the contrary, is not for us to say?

The "Presbyterian Banner" of August 1st, has an article upon the same subject, in which it fully endorses Dr. Monfort's interpretation of the action and spirit of the Assembly, and takes to task rather severely these "dead letter" men, for intimating that the Assembly does not mean what it says. The "Banner" says:

"The whole effect of such reasoning as this is merely to endeavor to assure hearers and readers that the Assembly did not mean what it said in 1865, and re-pealed in 1866, what it had done the year before." It goes on to say:

"Nothing could be wider of the mark; and how Dr. Smith could have given such an interpretation to the proceedings of the Assembly is passing strange."

"Equally unfounded is the assertion that the Assembly of 1866, regarded the action of 1865 as a "dead letter." But on the contrary, the Assembly of 1866 said the very reverse. The Memorial of the Convention, which was approved by the Assembly, urged upon the Assembly that, instead of its past deliverances being treated as a "dead letter," the Assembly lets nothing to change, explain, modify, take back, or amend."

Now we presume, that no one will dare to deny, that these two papers represent much more correctly the mind of the majority of that Assembly than any of the other papers in the country; and that they are in perfect sympathy with the radical leaders of that body. And they do not hesitate to charge Drs. Humphrey and Smith with misrepresenting the acts, spirit and intent of that Assembly.

The question arises then: why should Drs. Humphrey and Smith, in their speeches before the people misrepresent the action of the Assembly, and claim for it to have done what it took such special pains to affirm that it had not done? We can offer no other reason than that they are using their "strategic" powers in order to deceive the people of the border States, and lead them to still further acquiescence in those unconstitutional measures of the Assembly, until it shall have tied them hand and foot. And to a certain extent this "strategy" has already proved successful. The common people, instead of ascertaining for themselves, by a careful reading of the published proceedings of the Assembly, listen to the statements of these "strategists;" and from their former high standing and position in the Church, they credulously receive their statements as true. Hence the cry of even good people is still "wait! wait!" and as these orders and deliverances are only a "dead letter" and are not to be obeyed or enforced; perhaps the next Assembly will altogether repudiate these unconstitutional acts, and save us from protesting in this positive manner!

That the people should be influenced by such "strategy" is the more remarkable, when the actions of Drs. Humphrey and Smith are so diametrically in opposition to their assertions. We speak now with special reference to Dr. Humphrey. For while he is trying to persuade the people of Kentucky that these unconstitutional and unscriptural acts are a "dead letter," and nobody obeys them, he is urging upon the "Assembly's Presbytery of Louisville" to execute these very "dead letter" orders, and with singular effrontery to issue and execute other orders which are much more oppressive to his brethren, and equally as unconstitutional as those which he pronounces a "dead letter."

The Re-union question is rather a ticklish one, and like Dr. Hodge he is non-committal on that point. He closes his Review of the Assembly very much like the *Western Presbyterian*, in stating that it was not the reckless and turbulent body that some people imagine, and was a great improvement upon that of 1865, and he looks for its successor to still further elevate the standard of ecclesiastical propriety. Poor Dr. McKinney. In the future we advise you to occupy all your space with the "love stories." They are better than your Reviews; at least so say the children.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
How the Assembly Looks while in St. Louis, and How it Looks when at Home.

MR. EDITOR: What are the common people to think of the course of some of our most distinguished men, when they read such accounts of their sayings and doings, in and out of the Assembly at St. Louis, and their sayings and doings since the Assembly adjourned? "Truth" paints a portrait of one of our Kentucky divines which must certainly be unpleasant for that divine to gaze upon; and which he can not possibly, by all the logic in the world, make himself believe that any of his friends in Kentucky can admire.

We venture this prediction, that, if the real Presbyterian people of Kentucky fail to act like men in this crisis, then, in much less time than many of them have been in finding out that our former predictions have been fully verified, all we now predict in regard to the

designs of the General Assembly will be literally fulfilled. "We speak as to wise men, judge ye what we say."

Rev. Dr. McKinney's Review of the General Assembly of 1866.

It is probably known to most of our readers that Dr. McKinney, formerly editor of the *Presbyterian Banner*, and now associate editor of the North-western *Presbyterian*, has been editing and publishing for two years past a Magazine called "*The Family Treasure*," largely devoted to the dissemination of sickly and sickening "love stories," such as are found in the poorest class of what are known as "religious novels." This month however, Dr. McKinney seems to have thrown out some of this kind of matter, and occupies a page or two in writing a Review of the Assembly of 1866. And so unfamiliar has he become with subjects of this kind; and judging his "love-sick" readers by himself, he finds it necessary to define what the General Assembly is, which he does in the following fashion:

"The annual meeting of a whole church in council to consider her doings, give thanks for her successes, rectify her errors, enter into new resolves, and devise plans for the enlarged usefulness to the good of mankind and the glory of the Lord, cannot but be an occasion of intense interest to her devoted members. This meeting of the Presbyterian Church is denominated the General Assembly. It occurred this year in St. Louis, Mo."

Now for whom could Dr. McKinney have intended this piece of writing? Does he find it necessary thus formally to introduce his Pennsylvania *Presbyterian* readers to the General Assembly; or does his *Family Treasure* only circulate amongst the less intelligent "factory boys and girls" in the New England States. It appears to us that the children of old-fashioned Pennsylvania Presbyterians, unless they have become so absorbed in these "love stories" as to have utterly forgotten all about it, must feel insulted by such an introduction to the General Assembly.

After this formal introduction, Dr. McKinney tells his readers that "a General Assembly is a very correct manifestation of the piety, intelligence, temper, integrity, social condition and religious spirit of the whole denomination." In this instance, we would say, much the worse for the denomination. But not so Dr. McKinney. He next tells his readers that the Assembly paid less attention than usual to church-work. That its "efforts were disciplinary and penal, rather than sweetly attractive and edifying in faith and love." He says "The wanderer was visited with the rod of justice, more than commiserated, soothed and reclaimed by the sweetly constraining influence of forgiveness and love." And he takes special pains to inform his readers that this remark is made "historically, not condemnatorily." Like Dr. Humphrey, "he is in for the discipline."

Dr. McKinney next discourses at length concerning the Louisville Presbytery and the Declaration and Testimony; and cites with apparent satisfaction, that Dr. D. V. McLean offered a resolution depriving the members of that Presbytery of their seats in the Assembly. And that after earnestly advocating the resolution called the "previous question" which was carried. The adoption of Dr. Gurley's paper by 197 to 37, he says produced a profound sensation of relief in the Assembly. He thinks that Dr. Gurley's paper, as a whole, was regarded as embracing substantial practicable rectitude, and that the Church will receive it as vindicating her honor.

The Re-union question is rather a ticklish one, and like Dr. Hodge he is non-committal on that point. He closes his Review of the Assembly very much like the *Western Presbyterian*, in stating that it was not the reckless and turbulent body that some people imagine, and was a great improvement upon that of 1865, and he looks for its successor to still further elevate the standard of ecclesiastical propriety. Poor Dr. McKinney. In the future we advise you to occupy all your space with the "love stories." They are better than your Reviews; at least so say the children.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.
How the Assembly Looks while in St. Louis, and How it Looks when at Home.

It seems moreover that Dr. Joseph T. Smith has also been "sitting" for his likeness, which may yet be brought out with shades and tints which will very much disfigure the outward comeliness and placidness of that distinguished Baltimore divine.

It seems that Dr. Smith while in St. Louis, was denunciatory of the acts and spirit of the Assembly, and held council with Dr. Gurley as to the best method of checking the rampant radicalism of that majority of four-to-one. And yet Dr. Smith goes home to Baltimore and apologizes for "the brutal conduct" of that body, and even goes so far as to claim for it an ordinary respectability. As for Dr. Gurley, he is reported to have said that as the majority was radical, he was with the majority. "How are the mighty fallen?" W. N.

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.

Something More than Handkerchief Martyrdom—A most Atrocious Murder.

To its long catalogue of outrages on the Church, the dominant party in Missouri have added one more atrocious than any that has preceded it. A minister of the gospel has been murdered in cold blood—brutally, cowardly murdered, by one of Drake and Strong's avenging angels, self-constituted executioner of an infamous law.

Let those who made themselves merry by suggestions of pocket handkerchief martyrdom during the Sessions of the Assembly in St. Louis, read the following written by one of the slain minister's parishioners, well known in this city as worthy of full credit, and then let them ponder how much their words and actions may have contributed to the result:

"DEAR FRIEND: Another man has fallen a martyr to intolerance. That man of God, the Rev. Samuel S. Headlee, of the St. Louis Conference, is no more. He was killed day before yesterday by a mob for preaching the Gospel. The circumstances are as follows: He had an appointment to preach and organize the church at Pleasant View, a meeting house in Webster County, belonging to the M. E. Church South. On the 28th and 29th of July there had been made threats that if he preached, he would never preach again. The day came, there was a number of men, women and children present to hear the preacher, they thought the threats were made to deter. There were also some twenty or more armed men present, headed by a member of the church North. Before the preacher came, this leader and his men seemed to be mad. They said he should not preach, and threatened to use violence if he attempted. The preacher went to them and tried in a very mild way to persuade them to be cool and reasonable. He told them if he violated the law, in preaching, to enforce the law, for he was willing to abide the consequences. The leader said he cared nothing for the law, "there is my law," pointing to his armed men. The preacher then asked him, if he would let him preach if he and his friends went to their own land. They said they would not molest him.

Mr. H. and his friends then started off. When they had gone about half a mile, some of the armed men came galloping along. One of them drew a revolver and shot Mr. H. three times. Two shots entered his body; the other hit his arm. He died that night at ten o'clock, after giving his wife and friends his dying command, and like Stephen, praying for his murderers, he fell asleep in Jesus."

One of our morning papers, the St. Louis Times, makes the following comment on the above:

"It is almost impossible to speak of the crime as its enormity deserves and demands of passion."

When we reflect that for no offence, baser—while complying with the very demands of his murderer, Mr. Headlee was slain like a dog, indignation swells which recites every vice, every hand which recites is still ready for an avenging blow.

The poor victim of party madness and malice, had in now way merited attack. He is represented to have been amiable to a fault, the benefactor of the poor, the sincere friend of all. If he had an enemy, his name or the cause of his enmity was not known.

Even on the exciting question of the day, questions which affected him as a clergyman, it is not known that he ever expressed a public opinion, and yet a beast of the field was never more brutally shot down than he.

The narrative we give renders repetitive the account of his fate. It is by one of Mr. Headlee's parishioners, a man whose word is vouches for by Rev. Dr. McAnally, of this city. It bears upon its face the evidence of scrupulous truthfulness. It is a plain, unvarnished tale, and one that will affect the sympathies of every reader. We will add to it only by saying that the murdered man has been for twenty years a minister of the gospel, and that at the time of his death he occupied the honorably advanced position of a presiding elder in the Southern Methodist Church. It would insult the intelligence of the reader to inform him that the murderer is still uninjured and at large. It is equally superfluous to declare that in all probability he will never be brought to justice so long as the present dominant party holds sway in Missouri. That party is the protector of murderers, in league with them, and the justifier of their crimes.

But we can ever that vengeance is sure, however long it may delay its coming. There is no truth that we may accept with confidence if we refuse to believe that God will avenge the blood of His children. It cries to Him from the ground. For every murder committed, for every outrage, punishment must inevitably be visited.

If the leading men of this party were not mad, they would see to it that such wrongs were not repeated, and that those which have occurred were speedily investigated and remedied. They are however, unfortunately for them and the country, stark mad. So long have the revolver and the knife been at their service, that they do not reflect upon the consequen-

ces which follow. When forbearance ceases, when men take upon themselves the task of avenging the wrongs which the laws are deaf to hear, it will be too late. Then will come regrets, but regrets will not avail. We adjure them if they desire peace, to see that peace is made possible. If not, upon them be the consequences, and upon them alone."

For the Free Christian Commonwealth.

The Bible considered as cause to effect English and French Philosophers contrasted.

PART TWO.

The devil did not mistake his man when he chose Voltaire to best do an impossible work. He was a great and active agent of evil to a very large extent and through a long period of time. His empire of mischief was vast and various, and he did his work with an earnestness, fidelity, and roguishness, never surpassed. He had great forces at his command and he well knew how to manage them. He was able, crafty and spiteful. He was bland, humorous, or devilish, as the occasion required. He was vulgar, witty, or elegant, as the case demanded. He was, in a diabolical sense, all things to all men that he might win some; and if doing great things, be the measure of greatness, then this Frenchman was among the greatest of men.

But after all who thinks of equaling Voltaire with Bacon, Newton, Boyle, or Locke?

But in what does this inferiority consist? Not certainly in any great defect of natural endowments in comparison with those great Englishmen, but precisely in the utter destitution, on his part, of those great moral motives, principles, and attainments which imparted to them such beauty, symmetry, breadth, power, and majesty of character.

The English had their Bible and kept it side by side with all their science and all their investigations. They let the moral dimensions were equal to his intellectual, and both mutually helped to construct that high character so remarkable in all such men for its strength and harmony. Such men live, because they live in the everlasting truths and principles which have made themselves and which must make all others of similar moral lives and sentiments.

The injury therefore, which a nation

has inflicted upon its people by withholding the Bible from them is great beyond all weight and measure, all count and number. And to this end also we would say to all students eager for improvement and covetous of time, let no one fancy he has no time to spare for reading and studying the Bible. Let him well consider that his moral nature demands a due share of time to be sacredly and imperatively devoted to its interests. It cries out for knowledge and cultivation. Let him duly ponder also that to cheat his moral nature is suicidal to the highest and noblest half of his existence.

To this great object of human life, we would say to the student, drop the drudgery of daily study as the Sabbath ushers in its sacred hours. It will be a mental, as well as moral gain, to devote the day to its own proper and refreshing duties. Sabbath duties stir and strengthen the lagging powers of religious obligation and attention. A well spent Sabbath enlarges knowledge, enlightens faith and establishes that devotion which allies man with his Maker; and after a day thus spent, the mind returns with zest and refreshment to the studies of the Monday morning.

It is a low and absurd idea to treat the soul as a thing of merely hard dry intellect, to be wrought no where but amid the hard flint rocks of formal science and other formal things all the years of its earthly being. Let it indeed climb the heights and sound the depths of science, and let its range of knowledge on every hand be wide and various, yet let it all be mingled, ornamented and strengthened with large moral and religious acquirements. Let the mental and the moral keep equal pace and let there be no gulf of separation between them. It is this alone which can make the noble form of a harmoniously developed scholar.

Therefore, to neglect religious knowledge, culture and duties is a fraud of the highest magnitude and of the deepest injury that a man can inflict upon himself. All one sided studies make but one sided men and one sided thinking. This makes them ignorant and defective, and crude as philosophers. It exposes them to those low and easy forms of infidelity whose impossible glory it is to be ever putting the Bible and science in opposition to each other.

These are your philosophers who erect their wigwams on the inhospitable deserts of error, and wonder why all mankind do not come and take their lessons there as from the only seminaries of truth.

AMICUS.

Parties in the Presbyterian Church ten years ago.

DR. BRECKINRIDGE, in his review of the Assembly of 1855, presented the following view of parties, which it is interesting to compare with the state of parties now:

There remain in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church three types of opinion upon such of these things as there is any difference amongst us concerning. They occasionally appear with some distinctness: though we cannot avoid the belief that they are all drawing more nearly towards each other—and the points on which they are clearly distinguished are gradually diminishing, as the church advances on her high career, in the line of the immense force imparted to her in 1830-40. All three of these types appeared very obviously in the Assembly of 1855; and the most of what was peculiar in that Assembly, might perhaps be traced to this three-fold division of the body—and the various fluctuations of concert and antagonism of these three-fold elements.

But with the English philosophers we

side and hand in hand. These grand men, and lofty samples of christian life and power, were leagued with, and made themselves one with all the regenerated people of all coming time. Their names are embalmed in the history of christianity as well as in the histories of science, literature and philosophy.

But why is it that France displays an almost total destitution of that great moral and intellectual symmetry so common and so noble just across the channel? It is because France is not and has not been, for ages past, a Bible reading nation. Her great men and great scholars have known—but little of the Bible as a book of great moral and authoritative power. Hence their moral deficiency and inferiority to the English savans. Pascal indeed was fairly a match for the Englishmen and may justly be ranked among them. But Pascal was a most earnest student of the Bible. His moral dimensions were equal to his intellectual, and both mutually helped to construct that high character so remarkable in all such men for its strength and harmony. Such men live, because they live in the everlasting truths and principles which have made themselves and which must make all others of similar moral lives and sentiments.

The injury therefore, which a nation has inflicted upon its people by withholding the Bible from them is great beyond all weight and measure, all count and number. And to this end also we would say to all students eager for improvement and covetous of time, let no one fancy he has no time to spare for reading and studying the Bible. Let him well consider that his moral nature demands a due share of time to be sacredly and imperatively devoted to its interests. It cries out for knowledge and cultivation. Let him duly ponder also that to cheat his moral nature is suicidal to the highest and noblest half of his existence.

To this great object of human life, we would say to the student, drop the drudgery of daily study as the Sabbath ushers in its sacred hours. It will be a mental, as well as moral gain, to devote the day to its own proper and refreshing duties. Sabbath duties stir and strengthen the lagging powers of religious obligation and attention. A well spent Sabbath enlarges knowledge, enlightens faith and establishes that devotion which allies man with his Maker; and after a day thus spent, the mind returns with zest and refreshment to the studies of the Monday morning.

It is a low and absurd idea to treat the soul as a thing of merely hard dry intellect, to be wrought no where but amid the hard flint rocks of formal science and other formal things all the years of its earthly being. Let it indeed climb the heights and sound the depths of science, and let its range of knowledge on every hand be wide and various, yet let it all be mingled, ornamented and strengthened with large moral and religious acquirements. Let the mental and the moral keep equal pace and let there be no gulf of separation between them. It is this alone which can make the noble form of a harmoniously developed scholar.

Therefore, to neglect religious knowledge, culture and duties is a fraud of the highest magnitude and of the deepest injury that a man can inflict upon himself. All one sided studies make but one sided men and one sided thinking. This makes them ignorant and defective, and crude as philosophers. It exposes them to those low and easy forms of infidelity whose impossible glory it is to be ever putting the Bible and science in opposition to each other.

These are your philosophers who erect their wigwams on the inhospitable deserts of error, and wonder why all mankind do not come and take their lessons there as from the only seminaries of truth.

AMICUS.

Parties in the Presbyterian Church ten years ago.

DR. BRECKINRIDGE, in his review of the Assembly of 1855, presented the following view of parties, which it is interesting to compare with the state of parties now:

There remain in the bosom of the Presbyterian Church three types of opinion upon such of these things as there is any difference amongst us concerning. They occasionally appear with some distinctness: though we cannot avoid the

Free Christian Commonwealth

Rev. STUART ROBINSON, Editor.

A. DAVIDSON & Co., Publishers.

LOUISVILLE, KY., THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1866.

Br. Hodge on the General Assembly.

We have not shared in the disappointment of the large number of brethren who confidently expected Dr. Hodge to stand side by side with Dr. Boardman in manly and indignant protest against the action of the Assembly of 1866. For in view of Dr. Hodge's previous course; of his extremely radical political opinions; of his not very logical or consistent theories of the sphere of the church and the State; and of his oft exhibited infirmity of purpose, we saw no reason to expect that he would risk unseating himself at Princeton, by further exciting the truly Satanic spirit of our Presbyterian Jacobins, which, before the Assembly and in the Assembly, had been *rapping* out through certain wooden heads, its very ominous and significant curses at him.

It is but justice to Dr. Hodge to suggest that, for three very sufficient reasons, his brethren had no right to indulge expectations of his aid in resisting the Assembly of 1866.

In the first place, it was well known, that in connection with his many sound views of the nature and functions of the church, Dr. Hodge has held and uttered some of the most objectionable of the "Mayflower" heresies relative to the functions of the Church and the State respectively. He had asserted the right of Congress to send missionaries to teach religion in the West in case the church, with its more suitable agencies, had not anticipated Congress. He had asserted the right of any military Rosecrans to impose upon Presbyteries and Synods the infamous Missouri military oaths, as a condition precedent to their sitting as Christ's courts. He had with truly child-like simplicity transplanted from the columns of the *New York Tribune* to his grave quarterly, the wildest of its Jacobinical vagaries, a first truth of political law. He had, with equally child-like credulity, accepted and re-issued the silly untruths of Northern fanaticism concerning the slavery conserving purpose and mission of the Southern church. He had, in face of his own ecclesiastical theory of church power, intimated what he now openly asserts—adopting and applying to the Assembly the dogma of our political Jacobins touching the civil constitution—"That the General Assembly UNLESS EXPRESSLY PROHIBITED BY THE CONSTITUTION, can exercise its power to correct abuses or evils IMMEDIATELY IN ANY PART OF THE CHURCH." Thus making a burlesque of all constitutional government by constraining the constitution as a mere veto power, to limit in certain specified cases an otherwise Omnipotent Ecclesiastical Parliament.

In the second place, Dr. Hodge's antecedents as a witness-bearer for the truth, did not justify the expectation that he would stand fast even by his protest against the binding obligation of the outrageous orders of 1865, in case a determined purpose were evinced on the part of the Radicals to enforce them. He protested in 1861, that "the General Assembly in thus deciding a political question and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the church, has violated the constitution of the church and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master;" and yet in 1862, he asserted the right of the Assembly to pass the Breckinridge paper dictating a military policy to the government, demanding not only outward obedience, but the concurrence of the heart and conscience with the policy of the civil administration, and denouncing any who held different views as "faithless to all obligations, human and Divine." He endorsed in every form the action of the Assembly of 1845, denouncing the dogma of the sinfulness of slavery as operating a dissolution of the church itself; and yet declared that the Stanley Matthews paper of 1864, with all its Jacobinical philanthropism, denouncing slavery as a "guilt" met the full concurrence of his mind, heart and conscience. What reason, therefore, to suppose that though pronouncing the orders of 1865 unjust, unconstitutional and of no binding force, he would stand by that opinion after a majority of four to one in the Assembly of 1866 had pronounced his opinion on that subject "one of the most fatal of heresies."

In the third place, it was well known that from the time of 1835-7-8, Princeton had always held majorities in far greater respect than martyrs; and communion with majorities far wiser than communion with martyrs. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, "the venerable Nestor," who spoke what he did know, had told us, in his review of the Assembly of 1855, concerning the course of Princeton in 1835-8.

"The Church was saved without the cooperation of this 'Princeton party,' nay even against its strenuous opposition to most of the leading measures adopted to save it. But after it was saved, this party seems to have supposed that the church being saved in a manner very distasteful to it, could not get along without its supervision, and ought not to take any new step which it did not approve; in short,

that the church having acted without its consent on that great occasion, ought to be satisfied with this act of disrespect, and forbear to incur any charge of the sort again."

If Dr. Hodge, could in 1838, in face of his own protests against the "Act and Testimony" men, accept the leadership of that party in the majority, there was little reason to suppose that he would risk martyrdom in 1866 with the Declaration and Testimony men rather than accept the leadership of a majority of four to one with whose political sympathies he concurred, even though his ecclesiastical sympathies—now a minor question—were different.

We might multiply these illustrations were it worth while—to show that Dr. Hodge has taken just the course in 1866 which he might have been expected to take. Nay, if our limits permitted, it would be a matter of curious interest to show by analysis, that his very method of argument in this case is that pursued by him in all similar cases, viz:

While establishing the right of the Assembly's wrong doing by adroit appeals to the "higher law" back of the constitution, still to keep up the appearance

of great candor and wisdom by rather loose and feeble arguments against the Expediency of the Assembly's wrong doing.

But while not at all surprised at the general tenor of Dr. Hodge's argument and conclusions, we must confess to some surprise at the method and spirit of his review of the Assembly.

First of all, we are struck with his very remarkable silences. In an article purporting to be a comprehensive history of such important doings of the Assembly as are of permanent interest, we find not a single word of the condemnation of Dr. Hodge's own heresy in declaring the acts of 1865 not binding—though one would suppose that so grave a charge against the leading theological professor of the church, would be a matter important enough to deserve at least a passing allusion. It will be remembered that the Assembly "approved" the memorial of the convention, which after denouncing the Declaration and Testimony, proceeds also to—

"Invite attention to the vast multitudes of fatal heresies growing out of this subject—not the least of which is that which denies to the deliverances and injunctions of the Assembly during the past five years (upon slavery and rebellion), any binding force whatever. The action of the Supreme tribunal of our church is denounced as contrary to the constitution—* * * Those who thus revile the authority and disturb the harmony of the church, should be required to desist from such revolutionary and schismatical conduct."

Now it seems to us remarkable that such denunciations as these aimed, beyond all question, at Dr. Hodge himself should be passed over by him in utter silence; unless indeed we are to accept a few allusions to similar "revolutionary and schismatical conduct" on the part of Dr. Thomas and Doctor West as intended to be an offset against, and a justification of Dr. Hodge's heresies and revolutionary conduct. On the Saviour's principle: "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone," Dr. Hodge should have hesitated a little about hurling this first stone at the condemned Declaration and Testimony men. Or does he expect to buy his peace by his zealous assault upon the Declaration and Testimony; and have the public forget his own infinities in the hue and cry against his signs?

Equally remarkable, in the second place, is Dr. Hodge's silence concerning the extraordinary outrage of the Assembly in creating bogus elders for the Walnut street church, in order to procure a judicial decision from a civil judge in favor of an insolent Radicalism which treated congregation, Presbytery and Synod alike with contempt in appealing to the Assembly.

In the third place, very remarkable is the silence of Dr. Hodge about so remarkable a case—the first in our history as a church—as the outrage of the expulsion of Mr. Ferguson for no other offence than having written to a journal what five hundred people had said concerning the ecclesiastical buffoonery of a political member of the house.

And in the fourth place, very remarkable is the silence of Dr. Hodge concerning so grave a matter as the insulting rejection of Dr. Boardman's protest. This silence concerning an outrage so gross and unpardonable as the calamitous charge of disrespectful language against one who as a gentleman towered in the Assembly as "Saul among the prophets;" is the more significant because it naturally suggests the inquiry whether it arises from Dr. Hodge's unwillingness to stand by Dr. Boardman in his manly and indignant protests, or from sheer fear of the satanic Radicalism which spits its venom at Dr. Boardman in the Assembly.

And these and other silences concerning the wrong doings of the Assembly are the more noteworthy from the fact that Dr. Hodge in conclusion makes such minute and elaborate search for something "to be thankful for" in the Assembly's proceedings. Though we are constrained to admit that even though "small favors thankfully received" should now be the rule, Dr. Hodge has succeeded badly in his search.

We have no responsibility for the style, spirit, or logic of the *Declaration and Testimony* beyond signing it by proxy. We can therefore without immodesty express our opinion as to that point. Nor do we hesitate to say that the whole ado about its terms and spirit

is "mere gammon" a hue and cry gotten up as Dr. Hodge would say "for a purpose" by men conscious of their inability to deny its statements or refute its reasonings, and from them retailed second hand through the Church, until by dint of repetition the story becomes generally current. Consistently enough those who deny its great principle may complain of its terms and spirit; but not those who concur in its general views of truth. The very subject matter of the paper is of such a nature that if its statements and doctrines are true its terms and spirit are not unduly harsh and denunciatory, or if harsh and denunciatory it must be because its statements and doctrines are not true. Nevertheless, if our brethren find it needful to make a convenience of us—under pressure of either a logical, rhetorical or strategie necessity we—will not quarrel with them about it.

We are sorry to find that Dr. Hodge's new political associations seem to have taught him the language of sycophantic courtiers as they crawl around the footstool of imperial power, and the trick of thanking tyrants for blessings which it is not theirs to confer.

Neither can we sympathise with Dr.

Hodge's thankfulness in the third place,

that the Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine of schism, seeing that the Assembly had no right to teach any other doctrine, and notoriously did not practice the scriptural doctrine even if in words it taught it. For the same reason we cannot sympathise with Dr. Hodge in his fourth reason for thankfulness, "that the Assembly teaches the scriptural doctrine of slavery." For to say nothing of the fact that the Assembly has no business to teach anything else than scriptural doctrine, we can not for the life of us see that the Assembly teaches on this subject either the scriptural doctrine or what used to be the Princeton doctrine. As to Dr. Hodge's fifth and last ground of thankfulness that the Assembly "takes scriptural and liberal ground on the subject of christian union"—for the same reasons assigned above we cannot enter into Dr. Hodge's emotions of gratitude; especially seeing that the Assembly was liberal far beyond the Scriptures to the New School, and narrow toward our Southern brethren beyond all limits of common sense or decency, to say nothing of the scriptures. But is not amazing to find such a homily on gratitude as this coming from Princeton? Why did not Dr. Hodge add as a sixth ground of thankfulness that the Assembly was restrained from murdering Ferguson, or Boardman, or the Louisville commissioners?

But we find what we intended to be merely preliminary observations, have filled our present space. When we shall have published, as we intend, Dr. Hodge's argument on the right to exclude Louisville Presbytery, that our readers may hear both sides, we shall offer some remarks on his argument on that subject—which is the chief burden of his article—and also on his remarks upon the Declaration and Testimony.

Address to the Presbyterian People of Kentucky.

We have just received a pamphlet with this title, issued by brethren chiefly of West Lexington Presbytery, which beginning with the usual throwing out the tub to the Radical whale—that is, depreciation the spirit and mode of action of the Declaration and Testimony—begs the Radical brethren not to press upon them the issue by enforcing the Assembly's dissolving bull, and exhorts all to wait again for now the seventh time and see if the Assembly is in earnest. It is not in the style of Mr. Spilman's keen, lithe logic and unanswerable argument, but rather a homily for peace and quiet.

Feeling that we are no longer parties to this controversy—having reached our goal—and being disposed to exercise the largest charity toward our brethren, and to recognise their right to "the largest liberty" in the choice of their method of warfare against error and usurpation, we are indisposed to criticise either their own plan of the campaign, or their disapproval of the plan which we have executed. In the case of any other men than these excellent brethren of eastern and central Kentucky, we might be disposed to take offence at the quiet assumption, so habitual with them, of a certain superior unanimity of temper, moderation, wisdom and christian conservatism on their part which constitutes them natural umpires and mediators between the rash, violent, and bad tempered men of Danville on the one hand, and of Louisville on the other. For however it may be with Danville, we claim to be moderate as truth permits us to be. But we know the men, and are persuaded that with them this sort of assumption is no hypocritical pretence, as with our former "celestial" but now "satanic" party of Louisville and Danville, but simply an excessive zeal for peace and harmony in men who truly hold the "like precious faith with us."

A threat of summary discipline upon the "strategic" ante-reunion party in the Church.

The Presbytery of August 1, Dr. Monfort reviews at length Dr. Humphrey's remarkable "strategic" statement in his speech before the "Assembly's Presbytery of Louisville," touching the committee appointed by the Assembly, with a view to a re-union of the Old and New School. In that speech Dr. Humphreys stated—and emphatically said that of his own personal knowledge he knew it to be true—that the members of the Assembly who were opposed to re-union, agreed to the appointment of that committee under the expectation of defeating the whole thing by that appointment. Concerning this remarkable statement Dr. Monfort says:

"The Church did not expect such a statement as this from Dr. H. He and his brother took part in the union communion of the Assemblies at St. Louis, and the fact was noted as one of the pleasant signs of the times. How will these remarks before the Louisville Presbytery surprise every man who was present at this communion? How can any man justify himself in voting for the resolutions of our Assembly for the purpose of defeating the measure?"

We do not ourselves see how Dr. Humphrey can reconcile such an act as this with fidelity to the cause of truth, or even honorable christian conduct; and remembering that Dr. Humphrey was acting in the name of Christ in casting this "strategic" vote, it appears to us, from our view of the nature of a court of Dunbar, was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With his profession always came short of the reality; he was incapable of affecting what he did not feel; and it would have been for him an impossibility to use speech with the diplomatic art of concealing, instead of expressing his true intent. His action, like Cromwell's, was always vigorous, and at the goal of justice could be rigid. But his career could never have been marked by a massacre like that of Drogheda; or an execution like that of the King."

Jackson gives the following account of his own practical commentary on the exhortation—pray without ceasing:

"When we take our meals," said he, "then is the grace. When I take a draught of water, I always pause, as my palate receives the refreshment, to lift up my heart to God in thanks and prayer for the water of life. Whenever I drop a letter into the box at the post-office, I send a petition along with it, for God's blessing upon its mission and upon the person to whom it is sent. When I break the seal of a letter just received, I stop to pray to God that he may prepare me for its contents, and make it a messenger of good. When I go to my class-room, and await the arrangement of the cadets in their places, that is my time to intercede with God for them. And so of every other familiar act of the day." "But," said his friend, "do you not often forget these seasons, coming so frequently?" "No," said he, "I have made the practice habitual to me; and I can no more forget it, than to forget to drink when I am thirsty."

After his defeat of the five Federal Generals in succession in the Valley of Virginia, and when on his way by forced marches to Richmond, during an interval of rest on the Sabbath, we find him writing thus to Dr. White, his pastor:

"I am afraid that our people are looking to the wrong source for help, and ascribing our successes to those to whom they are not due. If we fail to trust in God, and to give him all the glory, our cause is ruined. Give to our friends at home due warning on this subject."

To another friend he wrote, Dec. 5, 1862, (eight days before the great battle of Fredericksburg.)

"Whilst we were near Winchester, it pleased our ever merciful Heavenly Father to visit my command with the rich outpouring of His Spirit. There were probably more than one hundred inquiring the way of life in my old brigade. It appears to me that we may look for growing piety and many conversions in the army; for it is the subject of prayer. If so many prayers were offered for the blessing of God upon any other organization, would we not expect the Answerer of prayer to hear the petitions, and send a blessing?"

How his religion entered into his views of every day military life, will appear from the following letter to his wife in 1861:

"The troops have been divided into brigades, and the Virginia forces under General Johnston constitute the first brigade, of which I am in command. I am very thankful to our kind Heavenly Father, for having given me such a fine brigade. He does bless me beyond my expectations, and infinitely beyond my deserts. I ought to be a devoted follower of the Redeemer."

And again in July, 1861, on the occasion of his promotion to the rank of Brigadier General:

"I have been officially informed of my promotion to be a Brigadier General of the Provisional Army of the Southern Confederacy. My promotion is beyond what I anticipated, as I only expected it to be in the volunteer forces of the State. One of the greatest (grounds) of desire for advancement, is the gratification of these orders—are in my judgment unconstitutional in form, unchristian in spirit, and every way intolerable. Our allegiance to Christ, and our ordination vow, to study the purity and peace of the Church, whatever persecution my come upon us for so doing, bind us to resist such revolutionary proceedings."

"Through the blessing of God I now have all that I ought to desire in the line of promotion. I would be very ungrateful if I were not contented, and exceedingly thankful to our kind Heavenly Father. May his blessing ever rest on you, is my fervent prayer!"

The account of the first great battle of Manassas, given to his wife, in a letter of July 22, is in like spirit:

"Yesterdays we fought a great battle,

and, until it was chilled by an influence as malign as fanaticism itself—the lust of power, it was disorganized. Every fibre of Jackson's being, as formed by nature and grace alike, was antagonistic to fanaticism and radicalism. He believed, indeed, in the glorious doctrines of providence and redemption, with an appropriating faith; he believed in his own spiritual life, and communion with God through His grace, and lived upon the Scripture promises; but he would never have mistaken the heated impulses of excitement for the inspirations of the Holy Ghost, to be asserted even beyond and against His own revealed word; nor would he have ever presumed on such a profane interpretation of His secret will, as to conclude that the victory of Dunbar was sufficient proof, without the teachings of Scriptural principles of duty, of the righteousness of the invasion of Scotland. There was never in Jackson's piety, a particle of that false heat which could prompt a wish to intrude into clerical functions. Every instinct of his soul approved the beauty of a regular and righteous order. His religion was of the type of Hampden, rather than of the Independent. Especially was his character unlike Cromwell's, in its freedom from cant; his correct taste abhorred it. Sincerity was his grand characteristic. With his profession always came short of the reality;

tal than any other in repulsing the main attack. This is for your own information only; *** Say nothing about it. Let another speak praise, not myself."

So also, his letter of Sept. 24, 1861:

"This is a very beautiful and lovely morning, beautiful emblem of the morning of eternity in heaven. I greatly enjoy it, after our cold, chilly weather, which has made me feel doubtful of my capacity, humanly speaking, to endure the campaign, should we remain longer in tents. But God, our God, will do, and does all things well, and if it is His pleasure that I should remain in the field, He will give me the ability to endure all its fatigues."

On the occasion of his further promotion to the grade of Major General in the Provisional Army, we find him writing thus to his wife under date of October 14, 1861:

"It gives my heart an additional gratification to read a letter that hasn't traveled on our holy Sabbath. I am very thankful to that good God, who withholds no good thing from me, (though I am so utterly unworthy and so ungrateful,) for making me a Major General of the Provisional Army of the Confederate States. The Commission dates from October 7th.

"What I need is a more grateful heart to the 'Giver of every good and perfect gift.' I have great reason to be thankful to our God for all His mercies which He has bestowed, and continues to shower upon me. Our hearts should overflow with gratitude to that God who has blessed us so abundantly and overabundantly. O that my life could be more devoted to magnifying His holy name!"

We shall devote still another number to these extracts, by way of illustrating Jackson's religious history during the last year of his life.

Dr. H. J. Van Dyke and the St. Louis Conference.

The great pressure upon our columns last week threw over the letter of Dr. Van Dyke whose "moderation and manliness" the *Reptory* celebrates.

We regret this the more because the letter might perhaps have decided the mind of some brethren hesitating in regard to duty in this matter.

For ourselves we feel disinclined to urge any body on the subject, any further than each one with the doings of the Assembly of 1866 before him may feel bound, as a witness-bearer for the truth, to act. We have even doubted whether the Louisville Presbytery should appear in this conference; but rather leave the conference to those who have not yet taken their stand on the subject of the Assembly's action. We have been very clear from the first that to all such as desire to make a determined resistance to the errors of doctrine and principle and the outrageous acts of the Assembly, no opportunity is to be lost in the spring resolutions. Had our advice been heeded the larger part of the Church might have been saved.

Our brethren did not agree with us then; many of them do not seem to agree with us now. But we have now exonerated our conscience in the matter, and are content to exonerate theirs in their own way—joining them in any measures they may think best. We trust every man from the East who can will follow Dr. Van Dyke's example:

Brooklyn, July 18, 1866.
REY. AND DEAR BROTHERS: I have read with deep interest the "Address to the Presbyterian people of God." The Christian spirit in which it discusses the great questions now agitating our Church, and the clearness with which it states the solemn issues involved, commend it to my heart and judgment. The brethren in Kentucky and Missouri who are suffering for righteousness sake under the usurpations of the late Assembly have my sincere sympathy, and shall have my hearty co-operation in every lawful measure for maintaining their rights in the

Free Christian Commonwealth

PUBLISHED EVERY WEEK AT LOU

ISVILLE.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION: \$3 00
For One Year, in advance,..... \$3 00
" " after Six Months..... 3 50

ADVERTISEMENTS

Not inconsistent with the character of the paper, will be admitted on the following terms:

For one Square (ten lines) or less, one insertion... \$1 50
" " one month..... 3 00
" " three months..... 6 00
" " six months..... 10 00
" " one year..... 15 00

Advertisements exceeding one square, will be charged at a proper reduction on the above rates.

All communications touching the paper, whether business or otherwise, should be addressed to

A. DAVIDSON & CO., Publishers,

No. 95, THIRD STREET, LOUISVILLE, KY.

OBITUARIES extending over ten (10) lines will be charged at the rate of 10cts per line—eight words to the line.

The One Man Church.

We learn that Col. D. R. Murray, a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church at Cloverport, Kentucky, who we understand is owner of the church building, on a recent occasion, closed the doors of that building against a minister of the gospel because he is a signer of the Declaration and Testimony.

It is very evident that Col. Murray does not regard the recent acts of the General Assembly as a "dead letter," but is ready to deny the signs of the Declaration and Testimony privileges which the Assembly has not denied them. The majority of the members of the church are, we understand, utterly opposed to the narrow contracted views of Col. Murray; and by invitation of their Baptist brethren, occupied their house of worship, where the whole people of the place flocked to hear the young minister preach the gospel.

We hope that the true Presbyterian people of Cloverport will at once set to work and build a house of worship. They will no doubt be aided in this work by the friends of a pure and free gospel in that region of country; and let Colonel Murray keep his church building for some of the unemployed ministers of the Assembly's Presbytery.

How the Doctors differ.

Both Dr. Smith and Humphrey, especially the latter, assure the orthodox people that the idea of a union with the New School is an absurdity.

Dr. Humphrey, in his eager zeal on the subject, even at the expense of his own sincerity as a christian gentleman, gave his Louisville hearers to understand that the whole movement of a committee on the Union was a mere trick to defeat the end proposed! And that, too, after having himself been one of the representatives in the solemn joint communion service of the two assemblies.

But we find that the Presbytery of St. Lawrence, which claims to be the "old, original Jacob Townsend," of the Union movement, and therefore well qualified to judge of the Assembly's action, passed on the 10th July, the following resolutions. Which now shall we believe, Dr. H. or the Presbytery of St. Lawrence?

WHEREAS, This Presbytery, in connection with the Presbytery of Ogdensburg, (O. S.) has the honor of having taken the initiative on the subject of the re-union of our respective General Assemblies, in a series of joint resolutions, adopted January 14th, 1862, one of which was as follows: "Resolved, That having confidence in each other's piety, orthodoxy, and patriotism, we desire to be united in one Presbytery, one Synod, and in one General Assembly, and that our General Assembly be overtured to that effect." Now therefore,

Resolved, That we heartily rejoice in the action of the last General Assembly on the subject of re-union, and give thanks to God for the prospect of a speedy accomplishment of this most desirable end.

Resolved, That the Presbytery of Ogdensburg (O. S.) be invited to meet with us in joint session, sometime during the progress of the St. Lawrence County Anniversaries, next winter.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.—The following letter from Dr. B. M. Smith, will be read with interest by all the friends of sound theological education. Mrs. Brown's liberal gift is a very timely one, and will greatly encourage the hearts of the professors in that school of the Prophets.

PETERSBURG, Va.; July 27th, 1866

Rev. and Dear Brother Brown.—The friends of Union Seminary are again called on to acknowledge the kind providence of the Great Head of the Church to that Institution. Mrs. George Brown, of Baltimore, has given ten thousand dollars to the funds of the Seminary with the special object of erecting a suitable Library building, to be called the "Brown Hall," and to this generous gift, it is due in part, the contribution of two thousand dollars by Mr. John L. Weeks, of Baltimore, towards the foundation of a Library fund, the interest of which will be applied to the purchase of books. To the funds for Library purposes, both for the building and purchase of books, I have very reliable grounds for saying there will be considerable additions from other sources.

Again may we exhort one another to hopeful efforts for this Institution. Our "border" friends, as well as many more remote from us, are waking up to a correct appreciation of the value of such a Theological Seminary to the interests of a sound Christianity and pure Presbyterianism. Well did one of the oldest members of the Board of Directors remark last Spring, "I never attended a meeting of this body when the affairs of the Institution were so promising."

Mrs. George Brown has thus added another to the many claims she has to the gratitude of good men and women all over the land, and especially in our suffering South.

May God long spare her life, and fill her heart more and more with the precious experience that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." B. M. Smith.

D. CUMMING STILL PREDICTING.—Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin has been elected President of the College at Lancaster, Pa., and the Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart, Vice President and Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy. No other changes were made in the Faculty, except that occasioned by the resignation of Professor Porter, who goes to Lafayette College, Pa.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., August 3d, 1866.
REV. STUART ROBINSON, D. D.

Dear Brother: There is in a late number of the "Free Christian Commonwealth," a notice I wish to correct to wit: "Rev. George Fraser, of Steubenville Ohio, has received a unanimous call from the First Presbyterian Church, (Old School) at Kansas City, Mo.; has accepted the same and commenced upon his work."

There is not a word of that notice true, except that he is here preaching.

The truth is J. L. Yantis, D. D. is State Supply for this church, and has been accepted once or twice. After he left, five members of our church met in the basement of the Baptist church, passed some resolutions inviting him to preach for them, which he accepted, and is at work; (I suppose Pope Jancey is footling up the bills.)

All this was done as they said because our board would not support Dr. Yantis, as he was a Declaration and Testimony man.

And this was done without the knowledge and consent of the church, as a church; we having at that time about forty members.

We have as a church, and are determined to stand by Dr. Yantis so long as he stands by the truth, as heretofore, notwithstanding the action of the General Assembly.

My Dear Brother, as I am not in the habit of writing for a newspaper, let me ask you to put this in readable form, and let the truth go as far and wide, as this false notice has gone.

While I am on this subject, I will ask you to call the attention of your many rich patrons, to the importance of sending some money to help us build a house to worship in, as we have none—are about to commence one. We are few in numbers, none of us rich. After making such an appeal in our behalf as you my think best, say to them that any money, drafts, or checks, should be directed to the trustees of the First Presbyterian Church, Old School, care of Wm. A. Allen, Kansas City, Mo.

In order that you may know what our city is, and is destined to be, I clip a few lines from our city paper.

Yours affectionately in Christ.

ELDER.

Action of the Church at Columbus, Ky.

At a meeting of the Presbyterian Church in Columbus, Ky., July 21st, 1866, according to the previous notice, all the Elders and Trustees, and nearly all the members being present.

Dr. T. H. Hendrick having been invited, took the Chair to moderate the meeting, and the following resolutions were offered by Judge W. R. Vance, and after a few remarks by the chairman and the mover, were unanimously adopted, viz:

1st Resolved, That fidelity to God, a conscientious regard to the ordinance of baptism, and the maintenance of faith in Christ, are the chief motives which induce us to earnest duty to maintain unimpaired the Constitution and order of the Old School Presbyterian Church, and to decline henceforth the sending of commissioners to the General Assembly, and thereby refuse to recognize its unconstitutional acts.

2d Resolved, That in view of the Assembly under we can find such a body as existed in our country previous to the year 1861, as will not take the crown of Christ, then corrupting both Church and State.

Elders, S. K. CALDWELL,
J. W. R. VANCE,
T. G. POOR

The LUTHERAN CHURCH DIVIDED.—The Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania, the oldest and most numerous of all the Synods of the United States, resolved at its last meeting that the so-called General Synod had entirely failed to accomplish the object for which it had been formed, and that by repeated violations of its own constitution it had become so disorganized and so disorganized as to make further connexion with it useless. It was also resolved to invite all Lutheran Synods which accept the unaltered Confession of Augsburg as their doctrinal standard, to hold some time this year a General Convention for the purpose of organizing a new General Synod. Delegates for such a convention have been chosen by the Synods of Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.—Thus the Lutheran Church of the United States will soon have two General Synods—one "Old Lutheran," and one "New Lutheran."

The "General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Northern States" has been recently in session in North Carolina. It was attended by representatives from four Synods—Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

One of the earliest acts of the Synod after its organization was to change the name from that above given to "The Evangelical Lutheran General Synod of North America." The majority took, as in former years decidedly High-Church ground, and hopes in the course of time to effect a union with the Pennsylvania Synod, which has just seceded from the General Synod of the United States, and with several of the independent High-Church Synods, such as that of Missouri.

Measures were taken to establish a weekly newspaper in the town of Charlotte, N. C., which will commence its issue in a few weeks. The paper will take the name of Dr. Conrad's old Western Evangelical Lutheran.

DR. CHALMERS READ PRAYERS.—Mr. Peter Mackenzie, an old newspaper proprietor and editor in Glasgow, in a letter to the Scotch contrabands states that the Rev. Dr. Chalmers told him that Dr. Chalmers used to read his prayers from manuscript, stating that from the period the Rev. Dr. came to Glasgow in the year 1815, till the period he left in the year 1823, he heard the whole of his sermons, with only some two or three exceptions, and affirming that during the whole of that period Dr. Chalmers never once read any of his prayers from manuscript.

Mrs. George Brown has thus added another to the many claims she has to the gratitude of good men and women all over the land, and especially in our suffering South.

May God long spare her life, and fill her heart more and more with the precious experience that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." B. M. Smith.

D. CUMMING STILL PREDICTING.—Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin has been elected President of the College at Lancaster, Pa., and the Rev. Dr. E. V. Gerhart, Vice President and Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy. No other changes were made in the Faculty, except that occasioned by the resignation of Professor Porter, who goes to Lafayette College, Pa.

Ebenezer Presbytery,
Will meet in Maysville on Thursday, the 4th day of September, at 7:30 o'clock, P. M.
R. F. CALDWELL, S. C.

Religious Items.

At the late commencement of Princeton College (Nassau Hall) the honorary degree of LL. D. was conferred on Professor Ormond Beatty, of Centre College.

The Presbyterian Church at Holly Springs is being completed. The "Reporter" says it is one of the finest country churches in the South.

The Rev. WM. E. McLAREN, pastor of the Second Church of Peoria, Ill., has received a unanimous call to the pastoral of the church at Decatur, Ill.

The Rev. B. H. McCOWN, sole proprietor and instructor. This School has been in successful and prosperous operation for ten years. The course of instruction fully meets the wants either of those wishing to prepare for advanced class in College, or of those who are seeking to acquire a thorough and practical English education. Modest and well behaved youths will here find the comforts of home, while its rural location will contribute to moral and religious training, apart from all sectarian bias.

2d Resolved, That we tender our sympathies to the bereaved family of the deceased.

Resolved, That in the death of Dr. Montgomery our profession has lost a bright ornament and wise counsellor—the community a benefactor—the cause of morality a zealous supporter—a kind husband and father—and every good man friend.

2d Resolved, That we tender our sympathies to the bereaved family of the deceased.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the family of the deceased; and a copy to the Hopewell Conservative, Louisville, for publication.

A. WEISER, Chmn.

S. C. YOUNG, Secretary.

The Presbytery of the Western District.

The Presbytery of the Western District stands adjourned to meet in Brownsville, Thursday (20th) before the 4th Sabbath of September, at 7:30 o'clock.

E. S. CAMPBELL, Slated Clerk.

Aug. 9.

The church at Rockford, Illinois, has given a unanimous call to the Rev. Joseph S. Grimes, late of New Castle, Pa.

The "Presbyterian Index" notices the arrival of the Rev. J. T. Paxton, who not being permitted to preach the gospel in Missouri by the persecution, is now seeking a field of labor at the South.

Brethren who may arrive in St. Louis on the day before the time appointed are requested to report at Dr. Anderson's Church (the Central) on the corner of Eighth and Locust streets, where a Committee of Entertainment will be waiting.

B. H. McCOWN,

Brownson's Station, Jefferson co., Ky.

July 17-2m

MOUNT WASHINGTON

Male and Female Academy.

T HIS institution, under the care of Rev. J. W. Heagen and Mrs. M. E. Heagen, will be open for the reception of students on the 1st Monday of September, 1866.

It. Washington is a healthy, happy, rural school situated on the Bardstown pike, twenty miles from the City of Louisville. The stage leaves Louisville every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday morning at 9 o'clock for Mt. Washington, arriving there at 12 m.

Boards, lights, fuel and washing, in family of Principal, per session of 26 weeks..... \$5 Tuition, from \$9 to \$20.

Boarding can also be obtained in good families in town, at very reasonable rates.

For further particulars, address

Rev. J. W. HEAGEN,

JULY 19th. 3m.

Mt. Washington, Ky.

J. W. HEAGEN,

July 12-1m

MISSOURI MEDICAL COLLEGE,

ST. LOUIS.

REORGANIZATION.

THE REGULAR LECTURES IN THIS INSTITUTION will commence the first of October, and continue until the first of March.

FACULTY: JOSEPH N. McDOWELL, M. D., Professor of Surgery.

JOHN S. MOORE, M. D., Prof. of Theory and Practice of Medicine.

JOSEPH N. McDOWELL, M. D., Prof. of General Practice.

W. M. McPHERSON, M. D., Prof. of Medical and Surgical Anatomy.

J. H. WATERS, M. D., Prof. of Physiology Pathology, and Clinical Medicine.

CHARLES O. CURTMAN, M. D., Prof. of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.

J. P. SHUMARD, M. D., Prof. of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children.

JAMES C. NIIDELET, M. D., Demonstrator of Anatomy.

FEES for the lectures (each Professor \$15). \$105, Matriculation fee \$5. Demonstrator's Ticket, \$10. Room rent for \$20.

JOSEPH N. McDOWELL, M. D., Dean,

Office No. 25 North Fifth Street,

And at the College, corner of Eighth and Gratiot.

May 12-1m

E. J. DAUMONT,

(LATE OF JAS. I. LEMON & CO.)

Dealer in

AMERICAN CLOCKS,

74 FOURTH ST., NEAR MAIN,

Opposite National Hotel,

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Watches and Jewelry repaired. All work thankfully received and promptly attended to.

JUNE 12-4m

BARDSTOWN FEMALE ACADEMY.

THE NEXT SESSION of this long established Institution will open on the Sixteenth of September, and continue through a term of Forty Weeks.

</div

Free Christian Commonwealth

Judge Kinkead's Letter to Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D.,

Nothing has surprised us more than the seeming want of interest which the mass of our more intelligent lawyers have taken in the great question of civil and religious liberty, which has been agitating both Church and State for several years past, unless it be the fact that some, from whom we expected better things, should have abandoned every principle of civil and religious liberty, of which the American people have been the boasted champions for a century past. We are gratified therefore in finding such a man as Judge Kinkead, taking up the matters presented by Dr. Humphrey; and in so clear and forcible a manner exposing the fallacy of Dr. H's argument.

We think Judge Kinkead unduly modest in regard to his ability in discussing ecclesiastical questions, and so we think our readers will judge after giving the letter a careful reading. And Dr. Humphrey himself we think must be of the same opinion, especially if he attempts a reply. The letter we clip from the Lexington *Observer and Reporter*.

To the Rev. E. P. Humphrey D. D.,

I have read with care your address before the Louisville Presbytery, delivered in Louisville on the 12th, of July, 1866. I have, as far as I could, divested my mind of all prejudice in the matters presented by you, and have attempted, with fairness and candor, to weigh all the facts and arguments, in the sincere desire to find out where the truth lay in this great controversy which so agitated the Church, especially in Kentucky. I must say that address, however able and eloquent, has not brought conviction nor satisfaction to my mind.

It may be viewed as presumption in a layman to venture any views or opinions upon matters which the clergy may regard as peculiarly in their province. I readily admit that such subjects are too high for me, who have not had the training nor bestowed on them the reflections to prepare one for such a discussion, I shall not, therefore, attempt it. But I may venture to propound the difficulties which have not been removed from my mind by this address, and to work as I may for myself a way through what it leaves obscure and unsatisfactory to what seems to me to be the true principles which underlie these matters—that I as well as others who may accept my views when called upon to act in reference to them, may not be left about on vague and indefinite opinions, but may have a fixed and stable foundation upon which to plant ourselves.

It is not my purpose, then, to undertake a review of your address. All I propose is to give my views upon such propositions as I cannot accept, and this I do with great deference for your opinions, though my mind upon the reflections I have bestowed thereon has come to a different conclusion from yours. And upon other matters I wish, if possible, to get clear and distinct responses to certain propositions which are either passed over or stated but vaguely in your address.

You state three radical principles. The first all accept: "The Church and State are both of them ordinances of God." The second will not be disputed. The object and ends of the Church are to make men Christians here and prepare them for Heaven hereafter. It is a spiritual kingdom of which our Lord Jesus Christ is head. We should ever bear in mind those solemn words of his, My Kingdom is not of this world. His saints on earth and in heaven constitute one host under his command.

The purposes of civil government are wholly different. It was ordained for men in a state of civil society, and looks to the preservation of their lives, their reputation and their property.

As to the third "radical principle," you state it substantially as follows: "Subjects which are purely secular in their nature belong exclusively to the State, such as tariffs, banks, &c., and any attempt on the part of the Church to determine them, ought to be resisted; so also subjects which are purely spiritual belong exclusively to the Church, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the Atonement, &c. But then you say, "There are subjects which may be called mixed, being in some of their aspects secular and in other aspects religious." —"Here," you say, "the rule is obvious. In mixed cases all those aspects which are secular belong to the State, and must be determined by a civil tribunal; all those aspects which are spiritual, to the Church, and must be turned over to the ecclesiastical courts."

Now let us examine the application of this doctrine and see if it be founded on the true principle. For if it shall be found that the Church in adopting it transcended her province, and thus went beyond the teachings of scripture and the standards of the Church, then, indeed, it was a grievous error, and to it may possibly be traced all the woes which now afflict her.

You say of the late rebellion, "It was a mixed case. That in secular aspects it belonged to the Government," &c. But you say "The rebellion presented aspects purely moral and religious." You quote the scriptural injunction, so often quoted, so full of wisdom, but in my opinion so often misunderstood: "Obey the powers that be, they are ordained of God." "Submit to lawful and constitutional authority." And then you lay down the duty of Christians not to obstruct or hinder the magistrate, but aid and assist him in his high office. You contend it was in this moral aspect of the question the Church was called upon to speak out.

Now it does seem to me that you have not been quite broad enough with this moral aspect of political questions in applying it only to what are called by you mixed cases, such as rebellion, &c. I would ask, is there not a moral and religious aspect in every political mat-

ter affecting the good order of society or the property or happiness of men in a civil state? Will not a Christian man be careful in forming his political opinions and regulating his civil conduct even touching such matters as tariffs, &c., lest by his wrongful act or opinions, wrong or oppression may be suffered by some portion of the community? He will give his aid that such laws shall be made that vice shall be punished and good men made safe and secure.

Now I would ask, is not every man morally and religiously bound to be careful that no improper motives, no selfishness, no malice, no ambition shall control him in forming his judgment and taking his stand on such questions? And is he not guilty of a great immorality and sin before God if he, from corrupt or improper motives, in such purely civil matters adopts wrong principles and aids in putting them into practical effect?

Here is clearly a high moral and religious duty. But I know you would be shocked to see the Church come down to soil her garments in such party conflicts as arise upon such questions as these. Each Christian man is left under his responsibility to God and his country upon his own conscience to choose his part and act for himself. If from improper motives he chooses and acts wrong, he sins against God, and God alone will judge him.

Now can the church undertake to decide upon the constitution of the United States, and settle the question, under that instrument, of the right of a State to secede from the Union. This, in my judgment, is a great political heresy, and who he attempts to put it into practical effect may be guilty of a great moral and religious wrong. But there are good men who have believed the doctrine. It is not vouchsafed the church to construe the Constitution of the United States and settle this political matter between us.

Then as to the moral aspect of this mixed question of the rebellion: Let us for a moment examine the principle you lay down and see where it will lead us. You say: "So long as no moral questions were involved in the contest, the church had nothing to do with it, but the moment that questions of right and wrong—of obedience to God—of immutable and eternal morality emerged from the clash of arms, then instantly the church was called to speak out." You continue: "Our church considered the rebellion wrong in point of morals, a sin against God, and for that reason it took jurisdiction of the case in that aspect of it."

Now I too thought the rebellion wrong. All who know me know how strong and fixed were my convictions on this subject. But I cannot believe it was in the province of the church as a body to pronounce whether the rebellion was wrong or right.

All admit that rebellions are sometimes right. The glorious revolution in England, which overthrew the bigoted and tyrannical James and established for that people Constitutional liberty under the great Prince of the house of Nassau, was surely a justifiable rebellion; nor will any one now deny that our Revolutionary Fathers were justified in their revolt from the oppressions of the mother country.

In the revolution of 1688, in England, Lord Macaulay tells us that "the greatest Anglican doctors of that age had maintained that no breach of law or contract, no excess of cruelty, rapacity or licentiousness on the part of the rightful King, could justify his people in withholding him by force. But my learned friend, I know, does not subscribe to this doctrine of "passive obedience." Had he lived at that time, he would have been ranged on the side of Baxter, Howe, and Bunyan, and William Kiffin; for his heart swells within him, as he refers to his own revolutionary fathers of the Presbyterian Church. With what eloquent and glowing language does he exhibit the action of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, on the Stamp Act in 1766; and how, in 1775, the Synod, under the leadership of John Witherspoon, took the side of the country against the King. We listen as to the stirring sound of a trumpet vibrating upon our ears the names of Witherspoon, and Allison, and Tenant, and Miller, and Daffield, and James Waddell, and John Blair Smith, all of whom by words, and many of them by deeds, took their part in the great struggle in which their country was then involved.

Thus it is conceded that rebellion is sometimes right. Now I will ask you who is to settle the question? Is the church authorized to fix the precise point at which the oppression and tyranny of her government are so great, the grievances so oppressive, that it becomes the duty of the people to resort to the terrible remedy of revolution? Can she say, "the grievances are not yet sufficient—you must submit?" Then again, "the grievances are now sufficient—gird on your swords and lif up the standard of revolt!"

It seems to me that the church, as a court of Jesus Christ, can settle no such question. She will pronounce the general scriptural injunction of obedience to the powers that be; "obey the laws as good citizens." But she has no warrant to pronounce when the time arises that resistance is justifiable. This, each member of her communion must, upon his own responsibility before God, determine for himself. I would not be understood as attempting to lessen the guilt of those who, without all sufficient grounds, rush headlong into rebellion.

It is a fearful thing; and upon a Christian man a terrible responsibility. And then it is a question the church cannot settle. He must determine it for himself.

This much then upon this general proposition.

It was scarcely to have been expected that, during the existence of the great civil war, the deliverances of the courts of the churches North or South, should command themselves to the sober judgment of mankind. But now is the time these questions shall be properly settled. It does seem to me that many of our present troubles are the result of these views with a dogmatic confidence, and shall surely renounce them when I find they are wrong.

W. B. KINKADE.

Dr. R. J. Breckinridge in the General Assembly of 1858.

A friend clips for us from an old No. of the *Southern Presbyterian*, the following report of the proceedings of the fifth day. We submit them without comment, as a comment on the ideas of 1866:

FIFTH DAY.

TUESDAY MORNING, May 11, '58.

The committee on bills and overtures made sundry reports.

The subject of the proposed union between this Assembly and the United Synod of the South, was taken up. Dr. Van Rensselaer presented a resolution ordering a special committee of three to be appointed by the Assembly to confer with the United Synod.

Dr. Stanton called for the reading of the communications of the United Synod. He also called on Dr. Breckinridge for a paper on the subject, which he had promised some days since.

Dr. Breckinridge spoke at length, and was listened to with marked attention.

We are told that on these questions there is a division in that other body; but what possible significance can that circumstance have for us, any more than a similar division in the Methodist or other church. I have no hatred towards them; I wish them good, and only good. I should sincerely grieve to see them wronged, and I should rejoice at witnessing their prosperity and happiness. Whatever their divisions, they are none of us, and our duty remains where it did before. We are to treat their parts as we treated their whole, having no duty to perform, growing out of their schism. Our door is open to them when they are like-minded with us.

Dr. Breckinridge then read the minute to which he had referred as follows:

In the matter of the proposals made at this General Assembly, on behalf of this United Synod of the Presbyterian Church, lately constituted in the State of Tennessee, out of a portion of those New School Presbyterians residing in several of the Southern States who have ceded from the denomination at and after the General Assembly of 1857, this Assembly makes the following deliverance:

1. Although the Committee appointed by the Synod of the United Presbyterian Church have not communicated to this General Assembly the official papers which that body is understood to have adopted, expressive of their own peculiar views and of the conditions, *sine qua non*, of the Conference proposed to this Assembly. Nevertheless, the contents of those papers being, in fact, known to this Assembly, we are not at liberty to act, as we were ignorant of them. And in the judgment of this Assembly, those official papers do not afford a basis of Conference, upon which this Assembly, is able to see that there is any prospect of advancing the interest of Christ's kingdom in general, or those of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, or those of the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in particular.

2. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has always received, and in Christian love, all churches, office bearers, and private persons of all denominations, making application for admission into her communion, upon the single condition that they are like minded with herself. At this time ample provision is made in her existing Acts and Ordinances for the reception of all such into her communion, on terms and by methods precisely equivalent, and where it is possible, identical with those provided in regard to her own children raised in her own bosom. Seeing that it was in a voluntary secession from the Presbyterian Church that the present difficulties of the United Synod of the Presbyterians had their origin, and that the door has always been open for the orderly return of such of those who left us, as were like minded with us, it can hardly be unexpected that we decline any official conference based on terms which appear to us to involve a condemnation of ourselves and a renunciation of the rich and peculiar favor of God upon us, in the very matters led to their secession from our Church twenty years ago.

3. With reference to the recent secession in the New School body, this General Assembly does not see, in any event, or in anything which has hitherto resulted from it, any call of providence for the Presbyterian Church to take any new steps whatever, either with the view of union or of a closer intercourse than now exist, with either of the parts into which that body is now divided. The subjects on which the whole New School body differed from us, at the period of their secession from us, and the subjects upon which the two very unequal portions of that body have recently separated from each other, are questions upon which we, as a denomination, are at peace, and with regard to the whole, which we see no occasion to revise the understand and unalterable faith of our Church, or to enter fruitless conferences.

4. With reference to the Christian Church by Hereditary Descent.

A profession, then, of faith in Christ, and of obedience to him, not discredited by other traits of character, entitles an adult to the privileges of his church.

5. And this is the first way of securing a succession of the covenant seed, and of handing down their blessings to the end of time.

6. But the second and principal channel of conveyance is hereditary descent. The relations and benefits of the covenant are the birthright of every child born of parents who are themselves of "the seed."

"I will establish," says God, "my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant."

The substance of which, to repeat a preceding proposition, manifestly is that, as soon as a new individual is generated from this one, he is within the covenant, and, according to its tenour, God is his God. This is a characteristic of every public covenant which God has made with man. Take, for example, the covenants with Adam and with Noah. Every human creature comes into being under the full operation of both these covenants. In virtue of one of them, he is an "heir of wrath;" and in virtue of the other, an heir of promise and mercy. He has the faithfulness of God pledged to him, as one of Noah's descendants, that the world shall not be drowned by a second deluge; nor visited by another calamity to exterminate his race.

Now, what imaginable reason can be assigned, why, in the covenant with his visible church, the uniform and consistent God should depart from his known rule of dispensation, and violate all the natural and moral analogies of his works and his government? It cannot be.

There is no such violation; there is no such departure. Nor is it so much as pretended to have happened from Abraham till John the Baptist, or perhaps the day of Pentecost. But what was in the ministry of the Baptist? What in

the effusion of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, to destroy a radical principle of that very church which John, and Jesus, and the spirit of Jesus, were sent to bless and perfect? The notion is wild. And if, as has been already demonstrated, the covenant with Abraham and his seed was a covenant with the visible church—if this covenant has never been abrogated—if its relations and privileges, with an exception in favor of adults who desired to come in on the profession of their faith, were to be propagated in the line of natural generation, THEN, it follows, that the infant seed of persons who are under this covenant, are themselves parties to it; are themselves members of the church; and whatever privileges that infant seed had, at any given period in the history of the church, it must retain so long as the covenant is in force. But the covenant is in force at this moment; therefore, at this moment, the covenant privileges of the infant seed are in force. Visible membership is one of those privileges; therefore the infant seed of church members are also members of the church.

However men may corrupt and have corrupted the ordinance of God, so as to reject the visible means which he has appointed for perpetuating his church, yet as they cannot overthrow his government, they are compelled to see the principle he contended for, operating with irresistible force, every hour before their eyes. For whether they will or not, the fact is, that the church of God, with an exception before mentioned, ever has been, and is now, propagated by hereditary descent. There is not, perhaps, in any nation under heaven that has been once christianized, and has not sinned away the gospel, a single Christian who has not received privileges as an inheritance from his fathers.

Let us then beware how, in opposing infant church membership, we fight against a principle which is wrought into the essence of all God's constitutions respecting the human race.

For the Children.

From the Children's Friend.

The Prophet Samuel.

My young readers will find the interesting event which is represented in the first book of Samuel. I hope they will refer to their Bibles and read the whole chapter. Indeed, in order to understand the matter fully, they must become familiar with the history of the child Samuel, beginning with the first chapter. I am sure many of them are well versed in this part of Bible history already; and those who are not, I hope will read it over carefully at once.

The name Samuel means "asked of God." The good Hannah had earnestly prayed God to grant her this child. God heard her prayer and fulfilled the desire of her heart; and in order to make her little child a constant memorial of God's goodness and faithfulness in answering her prayer, she called him Samuel.

Hannah and her devoted husband Elkanah, were both very pious persons; and according to the requirements of the Jewish worship, this man, "and all his house, went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice, and his vow," at Shiloh the place where the tabernacle worship was celebrated. It was at this place that Hannah had made her earnest prayer for this child; and now, when Samuel was given unto her, she dedicated him to the service of God forever to wait on the Lord at the tabernacle so long as he should live, and then to become a servant and a worshipper in the house of God in heaven. Hence she remained at home until she had weaned the little child.

When Samuel was old enough to

disperse with his mother's care, she and her husband took him up at the annual festival, to present him before the Lord. Along with him, they took up "three bullocks and one ephah of flour, and a bottle of wine, and brought him unto the house of the Lord in Shiloh: and the child was young. And they slew a bullock, and brought the child to Eli."

This venerable man was the chief priest of the Jews; and was also the Judge of the land of Israel at that time. His mother sang a beautiful psalm of thanksgiving on this occasion; and then having accomplished the worship of God in their offerings and vows, his parents returned to Ramah to their own house.

"And the child did minister to the Lord before Eli, the priest," being girded with a linen ephod. Moreover his mother made him a little coat, and brought it to him from year to year, when she came up with her husband to offer the yearly sacrifice.

The venerable priest Eli, was a very pious and good man; but his sons, on whom devolved much of the service of the tabernacle, were very wicked young men, called in the Bible, "sons of Belial." They did many things which were dishonest and oppressive to the people, the result of which, was, that men abhorred the offering of the Lord.

Now although Eli was a good man himself, he was not as faithful as he ought to have been in restraining and correcting his sons. True he remonstrated with them and reproved them.

But he ought, as a father and as a priest of God to have forbid and prevented their misconduct, but he did not. This sin eventually brought down on him and his house a most dreadful punishment.

But while these wicked young men were making themselves hated by the people, the child Samuel grew on, and was in favor both with the Lord, and also with men." Eli was very fond of him, and took good care of him, "and the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli."

The time was now coming when the Lord meant to visit with a righteous judgment those wicked young men who profaned the priest's office, thereby sinning against God and oppressing his people.

God had already warned Eli of his punishment by the word of a prophet; but there was no evidence of reformation in his sons, nor did he exert his authority to prevent their wickedness. Now, once more, he sends a message to him through the child Samuel.

Eli and Samuel had both lain down at night to sleep, when the Lord called Samuel. The child immediately answered, and went to Eli, supposing it was he who called him. Finding his mistake he returned to his couch. "Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed to him." The Lord called a second time, when Eli perceived it was God who was speaking to the child.

"Therefore Eli said unto Samuel, Go, lie down; and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shall say, Speak Lord; for thy servant heareth." So Samuel went, and lay down in his place. And the Lord came, and called as at other times, Samuel! Samuel! Then Samuel answered,

"Speak, for thy servant heareth." Whereupon, the Lord informed Samuel of the overthrow of the house of Eli, telling him that now the time was come, when he would both begin and finish all he had already threatened. This was the first revelation made to Samuel, and its subsequent fulfillment made the people of Israel to understand that he was established to be a prophet of God.

I cannot follow the history of the prophet Samuel. Except the life of our Saviour, there is scarcely any portion of the Bible history more interesting than the events which occurred during his life, with the most of which he was connected; and all of which are recorded in the books which bear his name. My little readers, I hope, will turn to their Bibles and read the account for themselves.